arXiv:1003.2021v1 [nucl-th] 10 Mar 2010

Residual interaction in Second RPA with density-dependent forces. Rearrangement terms

M. Grasso

Institut de Physique Nucléaire, Université Paris-Sud, IN2P3-CNRS, F-91406 Orsay Cedex, France

D. Gambacurta

Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia and INFN, Via Santa Sofia 64, I-95123 Catania, Italy

F. Catara

Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia and INFN, Via Santa Sofia 64, I-95123 Catania, Italy

---

Abstract

We derive the expression for the residual interaction to be used in the framework of the Second RPA with density-dependent forces. The adopted procedure is based on a variational approach. It is found that the residual interaction to be used in RPA and beyond RPA matrix elements is not the same as far as the rearrangement terms are concerned. A detailed derivation of the matrix elements coupling 1 particle-1 hole with 2 particle-2 hole and 2 particle-2 hole among themselves has been done and the corresponding rearrangement terms are shown here. This formal result indicates that both the currently used prescriptions, namely (i) using the same type of rearrangement terms in RPA and beyond RPA matrix elements or (ii) neglecting the rearrangement terms in beyond RPA matrix elements, are not correct.

Keywords: Variational method, second random-phase approximation, residual interaction
PACS: 21.30.-x, 21.60.-n, 21.60.Jz

The RPA is a widely used microscopic approach adopted to study collective modes which can be interpreted in terms of vibrations. In nuclear physics, the employment of this model with effective density-dependent interactions allows to successfully describe giant resonances and low-lying excitation modes. The second RPA (SRPA) is a natural extension of the RPA where 2 particle-2 hole ($2p$-$2h$) excitations are included together with the usual RPA 1 particle-1 hole ($1p-1h$) configurations, providing in this way a richer description of the excitation modes. On the other hand, the manifestation of new exotic modes in unstable nuclei has produced an increasing interest in the context of nuclear structure and the inclusion of complex configurations coupled among themselves may play a crucial role in the description of these phenomena. Moreover, some low-energy excitations like the first 0^+ and 2^+ states in magic nuclei are not well reproduced by the standard RPA model (they are predicted too high in energy) because beyond $1p$-$1h$ configurations are needed to describe them. Finally, SRPA would allow to study in a proper way the double phonon excitation modes that are experimentally well known in nuclei. In all these cases, interesting information may be provided by the application of SRPA.

The SRPA equations are well known since several decades (see, e.g., [1]). However, up to very recently, they have never been fully and self-consistently solved due to the heavy numerical effort that they require. Some approximations have been adopted in the past, namely the SRPA equations have been reduced to a simpler second Tamm-Dancoff model (see for instance [2, 3, 4, 5]) and/or the equations have been solved with uncorrelated $2p$-$2h$ states, i.e. the residual interaction terms in the matrix that couples $2p2h$ configurations among themselves have been neglected (diagonal approximation) [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. Very recently, the SRPA equations have been solved for some closed-shell nuclei using an interaction derived from the Argonne V18 potential (with the Unitary Correlation Operator Method) [13], for small metallic clusters in the jellium approximation [14] and for the magic nucleus ^{16}O with the Skyrme interaction [15].

The most currently employed phenomenological interactions in mean field approaches are density-dependent forces of Skyrme or Gogny type. It is well known that, with density-dependent forces, the residual interaction used to evaluate the RPA matrices A and B contains rearrangement terms generated by the derivative with respect to the density of the mean field hamiltonian (second derivative of the energy density functional). Moreover, rearrangement terms are present also in the single particle energies appearing in the diagonal part of the matrix A. Due to the density dependence of the interaction, the mean field is changed and the single particle energies are thus also modified by the variations of the density.

When dealing with the SRPA problem with density-dependent forces, a first formal aspect to consider is the determination of the residual interaction which has to be used in beyond RPA matrix elements. To our knowledge, this aspect has not yet been clarified in the literature.

In Ref. [16] the issue of the rearrangement terms has been studied in the context of shell model calculations while in Ref. [17] a prescription is introduced for the rearrangement terms appearing in matrix elements beyond the standard RPA ones. However, in more recent calculations [18], the same authors have not actually used that prescription and have not included those rearrangement terms.

This work differs from that of Ref. [17] for the following reasons. The ground state of the system is described as a superposition of $1p$-$1h$ and $2p$-$2h$ configurations build on top of the Hartree-Fock (HF) state, (see Eq. (2)). The coefficients describing these configurations are used as variational parameters and the SRPA equations are obtained, as shown in Ref. [19], by minimizing the expectation value of the Hamiltonian with respect to them. On the contrary, in Ref. [17] the $2p$-$2h$ degrees of freedom are not taken into account explicitly. In the case of density dependent forces, the RPA equations can be derived in the small amplitude limit of the Time Dependend Hartre-Fock (TDHF) method which allows to define the residual interaction as the second derivative of the energy density functional with respect to the density. This implies that the rearrangement terms appear and they are related to the first and second derivative of the interaction with respect to the density. Therefore, differently from Ref. [17], we consider an expansion of the interaction up to the second order in the density. This allows obtaining the correct definition of the rearrangement terms in the RPA matrices. Finally, the analysis done in [17] deals only with the rearrangement terms in the matrix elements between the $1p$-$1h$ and $2p$-$2h$ configurations while the coupling of the $2p$-$2h$ configurations among themselves is not studied.

In this work, we discuss the issue of the residual interaction in SRPA using the variational derivation of the SRPA equations proposed by Providencia [19], extending this derivation to the case of a density dependent force. As done in [19], we express the ground state $|\Psi>$ as

$$|\Psi >= expS|\Phi > \quad , \tag{1}$$

where $|\Phi>$ is the HF ground state and S is a linear superposition of $1p$-$1h$ and $2p$-$2h$ configurations

$$S = \sum_{ph} C_{ph} a^{\dagger}_{p} a_h + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{pp'hh'} C_{pp'hh'} a^{\dagger}_{p} a^{\dagger}_{p'} a_{h'} a_h \ . \tag{2}$$

considering thus a different and more general wave function than the one used in [17].

Let us denote with h, i, j, k and l hole states and with m, n, p and q particle states. We introduce:

$$\hat{C}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = C_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} - C_{\alpha\beta\delta\gamma} \ . \tag{3}$$

We consider the case of a density-dependent interaction and the Hamiltonian is thus written in the following form:

$$H = \sum_{\alpha\beta} t_{\alpha\beta} a^{\dagger}_{\alpha} a_{\beta} + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \hat{V}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}(\rho) a^{\dagger}_{\alpha} a^{\dagger}_{\beta} a_{\delta} a_{\gamma} \ , \tag{4}$$

where:

$$\hat{V}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}(\rho) = V_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}(\rho) - V_{\alpha\beta\delta\gamma}(\rho) \ . \tag{5}$$

The one body density ρ matrix can be expanded around the HF density $\rho^{(0)}$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\alpha\beta} =< \Psi|a^{\dagger}_{\beta} a_{\alpha}|\Psi >=< \Phi|e^{S^{\dagger}} a^{\dagger}_{\beta} a_{\alpha} e^{S}|\Phi > \\ =< \Phi|(1 + S^{\dagger} + \frac{1}{2} S^{\dagger 2} + ...) a^{\dagger}_{\beta} a_{\alpha} (1 + S + \frac{1}{2} S^{2} + ...)|\Phi > \\ \sim \rho^{(0)}_{\alpha\beta} + < \Phi|a^{\dagger}_{\beta} a_{\alpha} S + S^{\dagger} a^{\dagger}_{\beta} a_{\alpha}|\Phi > + \\ < \Phi|\frac{1}{2} a^{\dagger}_{\beta} a_{\alpha} S^{2} + S^{\dagger} a^{\dagger}_{\beta} a_{\alpha} S + \frac{1}{2} S^{\dagger 2} a^{\dagger}_{\beta} a_{\alpha}|\Phi >= \rho^{(0)}_{\alpha\beta} + \delta\rho_{\alpha\beta} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where we have truncated at the quadratic terms. Hence, the variation of the density is given by the sum of a linear $\delta\rho^{(1)}$ and a quadratic $\delta\rho^{(2)}$ contributions written as:

$$\delta\rho^{(1)}_{\alpha\beta} =< \Phi|a^{\dagger}_{\beta} a_{\alpha} S + S^{\dagger} a^{\dagger}_{\beta} a_{\alpha}|\Phi > \tag{7}$$

and

$$\delta\rho^{(2)}_{\alpha\beta} =< \Phi|\frac{1}{2} a^{\dagger}_{\beta} a_{\alpha} S^{2} + S^{\dagger} a^{\dagger}_{\beta} a_{\alpha} S + \frac{1}{2} S^{\dagger 2} a^{\dagger}_{\beta} a_{\alpha}|\Phi > \ . \tag{8}$$

In particular, one can find that:

$$\delta\rho^{(1)}_{hh'} = \delta\rho^{(1)}_{pp'} = 0 \ ; \delta\rho^{(1)}_{ph} = C_{ph} \ ; \delta\rho^{(1)}_{hp} = C^{*}_{ph} \ ; \tag{9}$$

$$\delta\rho^{(2)}_{ph} = \sum_{mi} C^{*}_{mi} \hat{C}_{pmhi} \ ; \delta\rho^{(2)}_{hp} = \sum_{mi} C_{mi} \hat{C}^{*}_{pmhi} \ ; \tag{10}$$

$$\delta\rho^{(2)}_{hh'} = -\sum_{m} C^{*}_{mh} C_{mh'} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{mni} \hat{C}^{*}_{mnih} \hat{C}_{mnih'} \ ; \tag{11}$$

$$\delta\rho^{(2)}_{pp'} = \sum_{i} C^{*}_{p'i} C_{pi} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{mij} \hat{C}^{*}_{p'mij} \hat{C}_{pmij} \ . \tag{12}$$

The mean value of the Hamiltoninan in $|\Psi>$, $< H >$, can be written as in Eq. (8) of Ref. [19]:

$$\begin{aligned} < H >=< \Phi|H|\Phi > + \sum_{mi} (C^{*}_{mi} \lambda_{mi}(\rho) + C_{mi} \lambda_{im}(\rho)) + \\ \sum_{i<j,m<n} (\hat{C}^{*}_{mnij} \hat{V}_{mnij}(\rho) + \hat{C}_{mnij} \hat{V}_{ijmn}(\rho)) + F^{(2)} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where $F^{(2)}$ is the sum of several quadratic contributions in C and C^{*} (see Eq. (8) of Ref. [19] for details).

In the above equation:

$$\lambda_{ab}(\rho) = t_{ab} + \sum_{k} \hat{V}_{akbk}(\rho) \ . \tag{14}$$

which, in cases where the interaction is not density-dependent, define the single particle energies. The A matrices appearing in the SRPA equations are defined by

$$A_{mi,pk} = \left[\frac{\delta^{2} < H >}{\delta C^{*}_{mi} \delta C_{pk}} \right]_{0} \equiv A_{11}; \tag{15}$$

$$A_{mi,pqkl} = \left[\frac{\delta^2 < H >}{\delta C^*_{mi}\delta \hat{C}_{pqkl}}\right]_0 \equiv A_{12}; \tag{16}$$

$$A_{mnij,pqkl} = \left[\frac{\delta^2 < H >}{\delta \hat{C}^*_{mnij}\delta \hat{C}_{pqkl}}\right]_0 \equiv A_{22}; \tag{17}$$

which are evaluated at $C = C^* = \hat{C} = \hat{C}^* = 0$. The corresponding B matrices are obtained by substituting in the previous equations the derivative with respect to C and $\hat{C}$ with the derivative with respect to C^* and $\hat{C}^*$, respectively. For example, the RPA B matrix is

$$B_{mi,pk} = \left[\frac{\delta^2 < H >}{\delta C^*_{mi}\delta C^*_{pk}}\right]_0 . \tag{18}$$

When the interaction is not density-dependent, only the $F^{(2)}$ term of Eq. (13) gives some contributions, since the others are not quadratic in the C's coefficients. The standard SRPA matrices are thus obtained (see Eqs (9)-(12) of Ref. [19]). If, on the contrary, the interaction is density-dependent, rearrangement terms appear and they are given by the first three terms of Eq. (13). In the following we focus our attention only on the rearrangement terms that have to be included in SRPA matrices.

As mentioned above, in the case of density dependent forces, RPA equations can be obtained in the small amplitude limit of TDHF and the single-particle energies contain only the first derivative of the interaction with respect to the density, while both the first and the second derivatives appear in the residual interaction. We thus expand $\hat{V}$ around the HF density $\rho^{(0)}$ and keep up to quadratic terms :

$$\hat{V}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}(\rho) \sim \hat{V}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}(\rho^{(0)}) + \sum_{ab}\left[\frac{\delta \hat{V}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}}{\delta\rho_{ab}}\right]_{\rho=\rho^{(0)}} \delta\rho_{ab} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{abcd}\left[\frac{\delta^2 \hat{V}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}}{\delta\rho_{ab}\delta\rho_{cd}}\right]_{\rho=\rho^{(0)}} \delta\rho_{ab}\delta\rho_{cd} \; ; \tag{19}$$

where

$$\delta\rho_{\alpha\beta} = \delta\rho^{(1)}_{\alpha\beta} + \delta\rho^{(2)}_{\alpha\beta}. \tag{20}$$

It can be shown that, by using the above definition for the RPA matrices and the previous expansion for the interaction, the usual RPA rearrangement terms are found.

For example, for the A_{11} matrix defined in Eq (15) we find

$$A_{mi,pk} = \delta_{ki}\epsilon_{mp} - \delta_{mp}\epsilon_{ki} + \mathscr{V}_{mkip}, \tag{21}$$

with the single particle energies given by

$$\epsilon_{ab} = \lambda_{ab}(\rho^{(0)}) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{kk'}\left[\frac{\delta \hat{V}_{kk'kk'}}{\delta\rho_{ba}}\right]_{\rho=\rho^{(0)}} \rho_{ba}, \tag{22}$$

where $\rho_{ba} = \psi^*_b\psi_a$ and ψ are the HF single particle wave functions. The rearrangement contribution in Eq. (22) comes out from the derivative of the first term appearing in the right side of Eq. (13); in the derivation of Eq. (22) we have used that $\rho^{(0)}_{hh'} = \delta_{hh'}$. In Eq. (21), the residual interaction is

$$\mathscr{V}_{mkip} = \hat{V}_{mkip}(\rho^{(0)}) + \sum_{h}\left[\frac{\delta \hat{V}_{mhih}}{\delta\rho_{kp}}\right]_{\rho=\rho^{(0)}} \rho_{kp} + \sum_{h}\left[\frac{\delta \hat{V}_{hkhp}}{\delta\rho_{mi}}\right]_{\rho=\rho^{(0)}} \rho_{mi} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{hh'}\left[\frac{\delta^2 \hat{V}_{hh'hh'}}{\delta\rho_{mi}\delta\rho_{kp}}\right]_{\rho=\rho^{(0)}} \rho_{mi}\rho_{kp}, \tag{23}$$

where the first term is the original interaction while all the others are the rearrangement terms. The first two come out from the λ quantities appearing in Eq. (13), while the last one derives from the mean value of the Hamiltonian in the HF state, i.e. the first term of Eq. (13).

Let us now focus our attention on the rearrangement terms appearing in the residual interaction of the matrix elements beyond the usual RPA. First of all, it comes out that no rearrangement terms appear in the matrix A_{22}, Eq. (17), except for the contributions

$$\begin{aligned} A^{(rearr)}_{mnij,pqkl} = &+\frac{1}{2}\delta_{nq}\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}\sum_{kk'}\left[\frac{\delta \hat{V}_{kk'kk'}}{\delta\rho_{pm}}\right]_{\rho=\rho^{(0)}} \rho_{pm} \\ &+\frac{1}{2}\delta_{mp}\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}\sum_{kk'}\left[\frac{\delta \hat{V}_{kk'kk'}}{\delta\rho_{qn}}\right]_{\rho=\rho^{(0)}} \rho_{qn} \\ &-\frac{1}{2}\delta_{mp}\delta_{nq}\delta_{jl}\sum_{kk'}\left[\frac{\delta \hat{V}_{kk'kk'}}{\delta\rho_{ki}}\right]_{\rho=\rho^{(0)}} \rho_{ki} \\ &-\frac{1}{2}\delta_{mp}\delta_{nq}\delta_{ik}\sum_{kk'}\left[\frac{\delta \hat{V}_{kk'kk'}}{\delta\rho_{lj}}\right]_{\rho=\rho^{(0)}} \rho_{lj} \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

generated by the first term of Eq. (13). The above terms, together with the λ quantities, give the correct single particle energies in the case of a density-dependent interaction, being thus completely consistent with the single particle energies appearing in the RPA matrix (21). No rearrangement terms appear in the B_{22} matrix.

Let us consider now the matrices coupling $1p$-$1h$ with $2p$-$2h$ configurations: the same kind of contributions discussed just above is found, that together with the first term appearing in Eq. 10 of ref. [19] gives a vanishing term due to the HF condition

$$\epsilon_{kp} = \lambda_{kp}(\rho^{(0)}) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{kk'}\left[\frac{\delta \hat{V}_{kk'kk'}}{\delta\rho_{pk}}\right]_{\rho=\rho^{(0)}} \rho_{pk} = 0. \tag{25}$$

In addition to that, we have only one type of rearrangement terms in the residual interaction, given by:

$$A^{(rearr)}_{mi,pqkl} = \left[\frac{\delta \hat{V}_{klpq}}{\delta\rho_{im}}\right]_{\rho=\rho^{(0)}} \rho_{im}. \tag{26}$$

A similar term is found in the B_{12}, namely

$$B^{(rearr)}_{mi,pqkl} = \left[\frac{\delta \hat{V}_{klpq}}{\delta\rho_{mi}}\right]_{\rho=\rho^{(0)}} \rho_{mi}. \tag{27}$$

We recall that, in the case of a two-body non density-dependent interaction, the B_{22} and B_{12} are found to be zero.

On the contrary, in the present case B_{12} has a non vanishing contribution coming from the rearrangement terms. This can be easily understood since the density-dependent part of the interaction mimics a three-body force and takes thus into account more complicated correlations.

Some conclusions can be thus drawn for the residual interaction of the matrix elements beyond RPA. A first kind of rearrangement terms appears in the matrix A_{22} giving the right definition of the single particle energies, consistently with RPA. The same kind of terms appears also in the A_{12} matrix which finally gives a vanishing contribution due to the HF condition Eq. (25). No rearrangement terms appear instead in the residual interaction of the A_{22} and B_{22} matrices. The B_{22} matrix is thus still equal to zero. A comment can be added concerning this last result, that, as a matter of fact, introduces an asymmetry between the A_{11} and A_{22} matrices, as far the residual interaction is concerned. This can be traced back to the fact that the interaction depends only on the one-body density. A different situation would occur in the case of more general forces, for example depending also on the two-body density matrix.

In the matrices A_{12} and B_{12}, rearrangement terms of the residual interaction are found and they are given by Eqs. (26) and (27), respectively. Their expression is different from the one of the RPA matrices. Therefore, the same definition of the residual interaction as in standard RPA cannot be adopted in the matrix elements describing the coupling between 1 particle-1 hole with 2 particle-2 hole and 2 particle-2 hole among themselves. At the same time, completely neglecting the rearrangement terms in the matrix elements beyond RPA is not correct. A quantitative study of the terms (26) and (27) could be useful and it will be done in a future work.

We are grateful to J.-F. Berger, N. Pillet, P. Schuck and N. Van Giai for fruitful and useful discussions.

[1] C. Yannouleas, Phys. Rev. C 35 (1986), 1159
[2] T. Hoshino and A. Arima, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37 (1976), 266
[3] W. Knupfer and M.G. Huber, Z. Phys. 276 (1976), 99
[4] S. Nishizaki and J. Wambach, Phys. Lett. B 349 (1995), 7
[5] S. Nishizaki and J. Wambach, Phys. Rev. C 57 (1998), 1515
[6] S. Adachi and S. Yoshida, Nucl. Phys. A 306 (1978), 53
[7] B. Schwesinger and J. Wambach, Phys. Lett. B 134 (1984), 29
[8] B. Schwesinger and J. Wambach, Nucl. Phys. A 426 (1984), 253
[9] S. Drozdz, V. Klent, J. Speth, and J. Wambach, Nucl. Phys. A 451 (1986), 11
[10] S. Drozdz, V. Klent, J. Speth, and J. Wambach, Phys. Lett. B 166 (1986), 18 451 (1986), 11
[11] C. Yannouleas, M. Dworzecka, and J.J. Griffin, Nucl. Phys. A 397 (1983), 239
[12] C. Yannouleas and S. Jang, Nucl. Phys. A 455 (1986), 40
[13] P. Papakonstantinou and R. Roth, Phys. Lett. B 671 (2009), 356
[14] D. Gambacurta and F. Catara, Phys. Rev. B 79 (2009), 085403
[15] D. Gambacurta, M. Grasso, and F. Catara, *arXiv:1002.3563* [nucl-th].
[16] M. Waroquier and J. Ryckebusch and J. Moreau and K. Heyde and N. Blasi and S. Y. van der Werf and G. Wenes, Physics Reports, 148 No. 5, 249, (1987)
[17] S. Adachi and S. Yoshida, Phys. Lett. B 81 (1979), 98
[18] S. Adachi and S. Yoshida, Nucl. Phys. A 462 (1987), 61
[19] J. da Providencia, Nucl. Phys. 61 (1965), 87